

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Norman (U.S. Patent 5,719,589) in view of Sumi (U.S. Patent 6,169,532). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references for at least those reasons as presented at pages 8-11 of the Rule 1.114(c) Amendment of October 26, 2007, which is incorporated herein by reference. Additionally, in specific response to the current Office Action, Applicants submit the following:

Neither of the cited references discloses or suggests:

during each of a plurality of reset periods, applying a first reset voltage *simultaneously* to *all* of said scan lines and applying a second reset voltage that is greater than said first reset voltage to *all* of said drive lines, *wherein a reset period [...] begins after each scan line is complete and ends prior to scanning the following scan line* (claim 1, *emphasis added*).

Regarding the scan lines, the Examiner refers to Norman as disclosing the claimed reset periods, specifically noting that Norman describes a row-by-row driving cycle resulting in sequential scanning and resting (reset) periods. Specifically, during the period in which one of the rows (e.g. row 2) is scanned, the other rows (e.g. rows 1 and 3-n) are unselected and connected to a row rest potential V_R . This is confirmed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The Examiner is correct that according to Norman, after a first row is scanned, for example, a second row is scanned. Thus, after the first row is scanned, and during the period when the second row is scanned, the first row is connected to a row rest potential. This is repeated sequentially for all rows and the scanning of the rows proceeds. Thus, in this sense, the first row

(and rows 3-n) are connected to a row rest potential (a “reset period”) while the second row is being scanned. Thus, by the time the last row is scanned, each of the rows will have received a row rest potential.

However, the presently-claimed method is distinct from the above-described method. According to the method of claim 1, there is a reset period after *each* scan line, during which a first reset voltage is applied *simultaneously* to *all* scan lines. In contrast, as noted above, Norman teaches that while one row is scanned, a row rest potential is applied to the other rows. In other words, even assuming that the period after a first row is scanned is a reset period, during that rest period the row rest potential is not applied to *all* rows, but rather is only applied to the rows not currently being scanned.

Further, Norman fails to disclose or suggest that during such a reset period after *each* scan line, a second reset voltage is applied to *all* drive lines. In the Office Action, the Examiner also refers to the possibility, in the Norman method, that the video data input signal is lost or disconnected, at which time there would be no selected rows or columns. The Examiner erroneously equates such an event to applying a first reset voltage to all scan lines and a second reset voltage to all drive lines. However, even assuming that the loss of a video data input signal were to result in a reset period during which a first reset voltage were applied to all scan lines and a second reset voltage were applied to all drive lines, *this does not begin after each scan lines is complete*. The Examiner notes that such losses are “an unfortunately inherent fact of life for all practical purposes of transmitting video/image data”. However, regardless of the frequency of such losses, such an event does not occur after *each* scan line is scanned.

Regarding Sumi, this reference also fails to disclose or suggest, even in combination with Norman, the above-quoted limitation of claim 1. In the current Office Action, the Examiner refers again to the description in Sumi of a period between image display frames as the claimed reset period. However, as previously noted in the Rule 1.114(c) Amendment, this period in Sumi only occurs after the complete scanning of one image display frame — i.e. only after the *last* row is scanned. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that because this period occurs at then end of each image display frame, by the time this period occurs, it is *after* each of the scan lines has been scanned. However, this does not meet the claimed limitation of ‘wherein a reset period of the plurality of reset periods begins after each scan line is complete *and ends prior to scanning the following line.*’ (claim 1, *emphasis added*).

Therefore, in view of at least those arguments presented in the Rule 1.114(c) Amendment of October 26, 2007 and above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references and that claims 2-18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-18 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/759,279

Q79062

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 28, 2008